







## THE CHINA MAIL.

## Mr. ROBERT HART, MR. J. ROSS BROWNE, AND THE BURLINGAME MISSION.

MR. R. HART'S NOTE ON THE BURLINGAME MISSION.

MR. J. R. BROWNE'S REMARKS THEREON.

(Concluded.)

(Continued.)

Throne, Person, etc. Finally, our Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria.

It is at the same time a source of much pleasure to me to have the opportunity of tendering to your Royal Highness a most cordial welcome on the occasion of his visit of Your Royal Highness to this distant dependency of the British Crown.

The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of the Diocese who is now in England, also wishes us to express to your Royal Highness his great regret that he is unable to be present, and to desire us, in his name, to make this manifestation of Loyalty and attachment to our Most Gracious Queen, and of Her Royal Highness to Your Royal Highness.

It is our constant prayer that the Most High God, who sees wherein we are, may be pleased long to bless, and keep the person, and to prosper the reign of our beloved Sovereign, that He may ever protect His Choicest gifts upon all the members of His Royal Family.

Subscribed at Victoria, Hongkong, this 11th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1869.

Repy.

H. E. H.'s reply to the address is in the following terms:

Generalissimo, "I thank you from my heart for the address you have presented to me. It is agreeable to my feelings to receive such a gift of welcome to myself, and of loyalty to the Queen from Members of a church to which I am my happiness to belong."

I send that your efforts in common with those of the other churches of the Colony, may long prosper, and that under their care a portion may be reserved bearing God and honoring the Queen.

I beg to accept my thanks for imparting the blessings of Heaven on behalf of my family and myself.

(Signed) ALWYN.

To the Archdeacon, Clergy, and Ministers of Religion in Hongkong.

TO-DAY'S POLICY.

Mr May on the Bench.

Two rather unusual "drunks" were the first cases disposed of. One victim was a Swede (seaman), and some difficulty was found in conveying to him the description of his offence. "He did not speak English," until his Worship gave it him in pure Saxon.

"You were drunk," when Mr. Swede at once brightened up with intelligence, saying "I know, I understand that." Fined 50 cents. The other victim came forward smiling; he was an Englishman and could understand English very well; but all he had to say was: "I did not know nothing about it, your Worship." It was intimated that the constable's coat was torn, and his Worship remarked that prisoner was violent in his "cups"; but prisoner did not know. Fined 50 cents, and paid \$1.00 damages, which was paid.

To-mor-mor (shopkeeper) and To Abo (shopkeeper) were charged, under somewhat peculiar circumstances. It appears that all information was laid yesterday by one of the seamen of the junk *Chow-fa-Yat*, to the effect that she cleared for Foochow on the 10th A.M., and proceeded willy-nilly through the Harbor, and at about 7 p.m. she had got no farther than East Point; here she was haled by a number of men, who pulled a seaman, when six junks were rowed up to her port clearance; this done without having been shown them the document which held the master (by name Low Ngow) and one of the seamen named Wong Aking, and dragged them over the side into the sampan. Low Ngow and Aking, if, upon the evidence, were held in the sampan to West Point, where they were confined on the top storey of a barge shop. The junk-master was robbed (as he says) of \$10, and he was laid off on reaching the barge's garret; the seaman who accompanied him was not laid up because he was "empty" (seaman). The only reason assigned by the leading defendant for this remarkable proceeding on his part were (first) that the junk-master had failed to carry out some promise to convey a certain cargo of brimstone to his (defendant's) shop; and (secondly) that the junk-master owed him \$20, and wished to go away without paying him. It appeared that Low Ngow (the junk-master) formerly had been entertained by the shopkeeper, and his chagrin at the failure to bring a business connection to his shop was the main reason why he engaged on this forlorn-hope sort of an adventure. The seaman who laid the information said that he yesterday saw his master and fellow-seaman looking from the windows of the barge's top storey, and gave information accordingly to the Police. Inspector Crook arrested the two defendants. The evidence was clear enough as to the violation of the principle of the defendants "that every Englishman (or Chinaman) that is his castle," and the case for the prosecution was strengthened by the semi-admission made by the defendant shopkeeper. The shopkeeper said that the junk-master owed him \$30, that he had put him off from time to time, and that he was trying to run away without paying him. He asked complainant to come on shore—or rather he denied the man to come—and he came. He denied the lying up. Mr. May observed that the shopkeeper knew very well that, if the junk-master owed him money, he could have got a writ to arrest him; and for the offence committed he fined the shop-keeper \$50, in default three months' imprisonment, and the shop-keeper was let off with the milder dose of \$5 fine, or seven days' imprisonment.

An unemployed seaman named James Wilson was charged with having robbed one named Antony Williams, boarding at Marshal's boarding-houses. Three coats, two pairs of trousers, and a revolver were taken from the complainant's chest. From remarks deposited as to having been made by the defendant to other boarders, and the fact (undeniable) that Wilson took the revolver and part of the clothing to a gambling-watchman to take care of, the conclusion was strong and clear that Wilson was the thief in this instance. Defendant himself acknowledged that he was one of a party of three who committed the robbery, but that all the blame had been put on him. Mr. May sent Wilson to hard labor for three months.

A case of cutting and wounding was this day disposed of which had been remanded for nearly a month. Two Chinese employed as butchers at the Eastern Slaughter House were charged, but one was dismissed, as the blow was shown to have been made by the first prisoner. It appears that the complainant and some others had taken a beat for slaughter, and that some words arose in reference to some money; prisoner, with his butcher's knife made a blow at the complainant, which took effect on the arm, nearly cutting it in two. The

wound (which was inflicted on the 17th ult.) caused excessive bleeding, and the wounded man has been in Hospital ever since. Mr. Brewster (from Mr. Caldwell's office) appeared for complainant, and Mr. Sharp was for the prisoner. Complainant contended that it was a most aggravated assault, and called for a very severe sentence; while, on the other hand, the prisoner's attorney maintained that it was not a case for a punishment of a very severe kind, as no animus seemed to have existed, and no vital part was hit at. Mr. May sent the prisoner to hard labor for six months, fourteen days of which time were ordered to be passed in solitary confinement on rice and water; also to pay \$200 damages to the wounded man in default one month's further imprisonment.

## LIGHT HOUSEES.

We extract the following from the Singa Government Gazette:

The following Notice to Mariners is published for general information:—By His Excellency's Command, —R. MACPHERSON, Lieutenant-Colonel, R.A., Colonial Secretary, Colonial Secretary's Office, 7th Oct., 1869.

REPLY.

H. E. H.'s reply to the address is in the following terms:

Generalissimo, "I thank you from my heart for the address you have presented to me. It is agreeable to my feelings to receive such a gift of welcome to myself, and of loyalty to the Queen from Members of a church to which I am my happiness to belong."

I send that your efforts in common with those of the other churches of the Colony, may long prosper, and that under their care a portion may be reserved bearing God and honoring the Queen.

I beg to accept my thanks for imparting the blessings of Heaven on behalf of my family and myself.

(Signed) ALWYN.

To the Archdeacon, Clergy, and Ministers of Religion in Hongkong.

TO-DAY'S POLICY.

Mr May on the Bench.

Two rather unusual "drunks" were the first cases disposed of. One victim was a Swede (seaman), and some difficulty was found in conveying to him the description of his offence. "He did not speak English," until his Worship gave it him in pure Saxon.

"You were drunk," when Mr. Swede at once brightened up with intelligence, saying "I know, I understand that." Fined 50 cents. The other victim came forward smiling; he was an Englishman and could understand English very well; but all he had to say was: "I did not know nothing about it, your Worship." It was intimated that the constable's coat was torn, and his Worship remarked that prisoner was violent in his "cups"; but prisoner did not know. Fined 50 cents, and paid \$1.00 damages, which was paid.

To-mor-mor (shopkeeper) and To Abo (shopkeeper) were charged, under somewhat peculiar circumstances. It appears that all information was laid yesterday by one of the seamen of the junk *Chow-fa-Yat*, to the effect that she cleared for Foochow on the 10th A.M., and proceeded willy-nilly through the Harbor, and at about 7 p.m. she had got no farther than East Point; here she was haled by a number of men, who pulled a seaman, when six junks were rowed up to her port clearance; this done without having been shown them the document which held the master (by name Low Ngow) and one of the seamen named Wong Aking, and dragged them over the side into the sampan. Low Ngow and Aking, if, upon the evidence, were held in the sampan to West Point, where they were confined on the top storey of a barge shop. The junk-master was robbed (as he says) of \$10, and he was laid off on reaching the barge's garret; the seaman who accompanied him was not laid up because he was "empty" (seaman). The only reason assigned by the leading defendant for this remarkable proceeding on his part were (first) that the junk-master had failed to carry out some promise to convey a certain cargo of brimstone to his (defendant's) shop; and (secondly) that the junk-master owed him \$20, and wished to go away without paying him. It appeared that Low Ngow (the junk-master) formerly had been entertained by the shopkeeper, and his chagrin at the failure to bring a business connection to his shop was the main reason why he engaged on this forlorn-hope sort of an adventure. The seaman who laid the information said that he yesterday saw his master and fellow-seaman looking from the windows of the barge's top storey, and gave information accordingly to the Police. Inspector Crook arrested the two defendants. The evidence was clear enough as to the violation of the principle of the defendants "that every Englishman (or Chinaman) that is his castle," and the case for the prosecution was strengthened by the semi-admission made by the defendant shopkeeper. The shopkeeper said that the junk-master owed him \$30, that he had put him off from time to time, and that he was trying to run away without paying him. He asked complainant to come on shore—or rather he denied the man to come—and he came. He denied the lying up. Mr. May observed that the shopkeeper knew very well that, if the junk-master owed him money, he could have got a writ to arrest him; and for the offence committed he fined the shop-keeper \$50, in default three months' imprisonment, and the shop-keeper was let off with the milder dose of \$5 fine, or seven days' imprisonment.

To-mor-mor (shopkeeper) and To Abo (shopkeeper) were charged, under somewhat peculiar circumstances. It appears that all information was laid yesterday by one of the seamen of the junk *Chow-fa-Yat*, to the effect that she cleared for Foochow on the 10th A.M., and proceeded willy-nilly through the Harbor, and at about 7 p.m. she had got no farther than East Point; here she was haled by a number of men, who pulled a seaman, when six junks were rowed up to her port clearance; this done without having been shown them the document which held the master (by name Low Ngow) and one of the seamen named Wong Aking, and dragged them over the side into the sampan. Low Ngow and Aking, if, upon the evidence, were held in the sampan to West Point, where they were confined on the top storey of a barge shop. The junk-master was robbed (as he says) of \$10, and he was laid off on reaching the barge's garret; the seaman who accompanied him was not laid up because he was "empty" (seaman). The only reason assigned by the leading defendant for this remarkable proceeding on his part were (first) that the junk-master had failed to carry out some promise to convey a certain cargo of brimstone to his (defendant's) shop; and (secondly) that the junk-master owed him \$20, and wished to go away without paying him. It appeared that Low Ngow (the junk-master) formerly had been entertained by the shopkeeper, and his chagrin at the failure to bring a business connection to his shop was the main reason why he engaged on this forlorn-hope sort of an adventure. The seaman who laid the information said that he yesterday saw his master and fellow-seaman looking from the windows of the barge's top storey, and gave information accordingly to the Police. Inspector Crook arrested the two defendants. The evidence was clear enough as to the violation of the principle of the defendants "that every Englishman (or Chinaman) that is his castle," and the case for the prosecution was strengthened by the semi-admission made by the defendant shopkeeper. The shopkeeper said that the junk-master owed him \$30, that he had put him off from time to time, and that he was trying to run away without paying him. He asked complainant to come on shore—or rather he denied the man to come—and he came. He denied the lying up. Mr. May observed that the shopkeeper knew very well that, if the junk-master owed him money, he could have got a writ to arrest him; and for the offence committed he fined the shop-keeper \$50, in default three months' imprisonment, and the shop-keeper was let off with the milder dose of \$5 fine, or seven days' imprisonment.

To-mor-mor (shopkeeper) and To Abo (shopkeeper) were charged, under somewhat peculiar circumstances. It appears that all information was laid yesterday by one of the seamen of the junk *Chow-fa-Yat*, to the effect that she cleared for Foochow on the 10th A.M., and proceeded willy-nilly through the Harbor, and at about 7 p.m. she had got no farther than East Point; here she was haled by a number of men, who pulled a seaman, when six junks were rowed up to her port clearance; this done without having been shown them the document which held the master (by name Low Ngow) and one of the seamen named Wong Aking, and dragged them over the side into the sampan. Low Ngow and Aking, if, upon the evidence, were held in the sampan to West Point, where they were confined on the top storey of a barge shop. The junk-master was robbed (as he says) of \$10, and he was laid off on reaching the barge's garret; the seaman who accompanied him was not laid up because he was "empty" (seaman). The only reason assigned by the leading defendant for this remarkable proceeding on his part were (first) that the junk-master had failed to carry out some promise to convey a certain cargo of brimstone to his (defendant's) shop; and (secondly) that the junk-master owed him \$20, and wished to go away without paying him. It appeared that Low Ngow (the junk-master) formerly had been entertained by the shopkeeper, and his chagrin at the failure to bring a business connection to his shop was the main reason why he engaged on this forlorn-hope sort of an adventure. The seaman who laid the information said that he yesterday saw his master and fellow-seaman looking from the windows of the barge's top storey, and gave information accordingly to the Police. Inspector Crook arrested the two defendants. The evidence was clear enough as to the violation of the principle of the defendants "that every Englishman (or Chinaman) that is his castle," and the case for the prosecution was strengthened by the semi-admission made by the defendant shopkeeper. The shopkeeper said that the junk-master owed him \$30, that he had put him off from time to time, and that he was trying to run away without paying him. He asked complainant to come on shore—or rather he denied the man to come—and he came. He denied the lying up. Mr. May observed that the shopkeeper knew very well that, if the junk-master owed him money, he could have got a writ to arrest him; and for the offence committed he fined the shop-keeper \$50, in default three months' imprisonment, and the shop-keeper was let off with the milder dose of \$5 fine, or seven days' imprisonment.

To-mor-mor (shopkeeper) and To Abo (shopkeeper) were charged, under somewhat peculiar circumstances. It appears that all information was laid yesterday by one of the seamen of the junk *Chow-fa-Yat*, to the effect that she cleared for Foochow on the 10th A.M., and proceeded willy-nilly through the Harbor, and at about 7 p.m. she had got no farther than East Point; here she was haled by a number of men, who pulled a seaman, when six junks were rowed up to her port clearance; this done without having been shown them the document which held the master (by name Low Ngow) and one of the seamen named Wong Aking, and dragged them over the side into the sampan. Low Ngow and Aking, if, upon the evidence, were held in the sampan to West Point, where they were confined on the top storey of a barge shop. The junk-master was robbed (as he says) of \$10, and he was laid off on reaching the barge's garret; the seaman who accompanied him was not laid up because he was "empty" (seaman). The only reason assigned by the leading defendant for this remarkable proceeding on his part were (first) that the junk-master had failed to carry out some promise to convey a certain cargo of brimstone to his (defendant's) shop; and (secondly) that the junk-master owed him \$20, and wished to go away without paying him. It appeared that Low Ngow (the junk-master) formerly had been entertained by the shopkeeper, and his chagrin at the failure to bring a business connection to his shop was the main reason why he engaged on this forlorn-hope sort of an adventure. The seaman who laid the information said that he yesterday saw his master and fellow-seaman looking from the windows of the barge's top storey, and gave information accordingly to the Police. Inspector Crook arrested the two defendants. The evidence was clear enough as to the violation of the principle of the defendants "that every Englishman (or Chinaman) that is his castle," and the case for the prosecution was strengthened by the semi-admission made by the defendant shopkeeper. The shopkeeper said that the junk-master owed him \$30, that he had put him off from time to time, and that he was trying to run away without paying him. He asked complainant to come on shore—or rather he denied the man to come—and he came. He denied the lying up. Mr. May observed that the shopkeeper knew very well that, if the junk-master owed him money, he could have got a writ to arrest him; and for the offence committed he fined the shop-keeper \$50, in default three months' imprisonment, and the shop-keeper was let off with the milder dose of \$5 fine, or seven days' imprisonment.

To-mor-mor (shopkeeper) and To Abo (shopkeeper) were charged, under somewhat peculiar circumstances. It appears that all information was laid yesterday by one of the seamen of the junk *Chow-fa-Yat*, to the effect that she cleared for Foochow on the 10th A.M., and proceeded willy-nilly through the Harbor, and at about 7 p.m. she had got no farther than East Point; here she was haled by a number of men, who pulled a seaman, when six junks were rowed up to her port clearance; this done without having been shown them the document which held the master (by name Low Ngow) and one of the seamen named Wong Aking, and dragged them over the side into the sampan. Low Ngow and Aking, if, upon the evidence, were held in the sampan to West Point, where they were confined on the top storey of a barge shop. The junk-master was robbed (as he says) of \$10, and he was laid off on reaching the barge's garret; the seaman who accompanied him was not laid up because he was "empty" (seaman). The only reason assigned by the leading defendant for this remarkable proceeding on his part were (first) that the junk-master had failed to carry out some promise to convey a certain cargo of brimstone to his (defendant's) shop; and (secondly) that the junk-master owed him \$20, and wished to go away without paying him. It appeared that Low Ngow (the junk-master) formerly had been entertained by the shopkeeper, and his chagrin at the failure to bring a business connection to his shop was the main reason why he engaged on this forlorn-hope sort of an adventure. The seaman who laid the information said that he yesterday saw his master and fellow-seaman looking from the windows of the barge's top storey, and gave information accordingly to the Police. Inspector Crook arrested the two defendants. The evidence was clear enough as to the violation of the principle of the defendants "that every Englishman (or Chinaman) that is his castle," and the case for the prosecution was strengthened by the semi-admission made by the defendant shopkeeper. The shopkeeper said that the junk-master owed him \$30, that he had put him off from time to time, and that he was trying to run away without paying him. He asked complainant to come on shore—or rather he denied the man to come—and he came. He denied the lying up. Mr. May observed that the shopkeeper knew very well that, if the junk-master owed him money, he could have got a writ to arrest him; and for the offence committed he fined the shop-keeper \$50, in default three months' imprisonment, and the shop-keeper was let off with the milder dose of \$5 fine, or seven days' imprisonment.

To-mor-mor (shopkeeper) and To Abo (shopkeeper) were charged, under somewhat peculiar circumstances. It appears that all information was laid yesterday by one of the seamen of the junk *Chow-fa-Yat*, to the effect that she cleared for Foochow on the 10th A.M., and proceeded willy-nilly through the Harbor, and at about 7 p.m. she had got no farther than East Point; here she was haled by a number of men, who pulled a seaman, when six junks were rowed up to her port clearance; this done without having been shown them the document which held the master (by name Low Ngow) and one of the seamen named Wong Aking, and dragged them over the side into the sampan. Low Ngow and Aking, if, upon the evidence, were held in the sampan to West Point, where they were confined on the top storey of a barge shop. The junk-master was robbed (as he says) of \$10, and he was laid off on reaching the barge's garret; the seaman who accompanied him was not laid up because he was "empty" (seaman). The only reason assigned by the leading defendant for this remarkable proceeding on his part were (first) that the junk-master had failed to carry out some promise to convey a certain cargo of brimstone to his (defendant's) shop; and (secondly) that the junk-master owed him \$20, and wished to go away without paying him. It appeared that Low Ngow (the junk-master) formerly had been entertained by the shopkeeper, and his chagrin at the failure to bring a business connection to his shop was the main reason why he engaged on this forlorn-hope sort of an adventure. The seaman who laid the information said that he yesterday saw his master and fellow-seaman looking from the windows of the barge's top storey, and gave information accordingly to the Police. Inspector Crook arrested the two defendants. The evidence was clear enough as to the violation of the principle of the defendants "that every Englishman (or Chinaman) that is his castle," and the case for the prosecution was strengthened by the semi-admission made by the defendant shopkeeper. The shopkeeper said that the junk-master owed him \$30, that he had put him off from time to time, and that he was trying to run away without paying him. He asked complainant to come on shore—or rather he denied the man to come—and he came. He denied the lying up. Mr. May observed that the shopkeeper knew very well that, if the junk-master owed him money, he could have got a writ to arrest him; and for the offence committed he fined the shop-keeper \$50, in default three months' imprisonment, and the shop-keeper was let off with the milder dose of \$5 fine, or seven days' imprisonment.

To-mor-mor (shopkeeper) and To Abo (shopkeeper) were charged, under somewhat peculiar circumstances. It appears that all information was laid yesterday by one of the seamen of the junk *Chow-fa-Yat*, to the effect that she cleared for Foochow on the 10th A.M., and proceeded willy-nilly through the Harbor, and at about 7 p.m. she had got no farther than East Point; here she was haled by a number of men, who pulled a seaman, when six junks were rowed up to her port clearance; this done without having been shown them the document which held the master (by name Low Ngow) and one of the seamen named Wong Aking, and dragged them over the side into the sampan. Low Ngow and Aking, if, upon the evidence, were held in the sampan to West Point, where they were confined on the top storey of a barge shop. The junk-master was robbed (as he says) of \$10, and he was laid off on reaching the barge's garret; the seaman who accompanied him was not laid up because he was "empty" (seaman). The only reason assigned by the leading defendant for this remarkable proceeding on his part were (first) that the junk-master had failed to carry out some promise to convey a certain cargo of brimstone to his (defendant's) shop; and (secondly) that the junk-master owed him \$20, and wished to go away without paying him. It appeared that Low Ngow (the junk-master) formerly had been entertained by the shopkeeper, and his chagrin at the failure





